

Approved For Release 2001/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06086A000100010006-5

O-M 2-2

## Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Chief, Operations School

DATE: 16 February 1960

FROM : Chief, Field Training

SUBJECT: Summary of Visit of I. G. Personnel to Field Training,  
9 - 11 February 1960

1. During the period 1200, on 9 February through 1200, on 11 February 1960, three representatives of the Inspector General's Office visited Field Training and discussed all matters of training with the staff. The I. G. representatives were: Messrs. [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

2. The main points of interest in order of their seeming importance:

A. The relationship of DDP to our training program:

(1) How are courses evolved?

(2) What content contribution is made by the DDP?

(3) What is the channel of flow of case materials from the DDP?

25X1A9a

B. The orientation of JOT training. ([REDACTED] seemed to be developing the conviction that Field Training is slanted too heavily toward DDP. Perhaps we did not stress that this is a part of the "Operations" School.)

C. Questions relative to JOT Program and evolvement of their training:

(1) Are JOT's finished C/O's when they leave here?

(2) What should be the order of JOT training and use?

a. Should they first work on a desk and then come to training?

b. Should they go from training to the field; perhaps for even a short period of six months?

c. Is desk training essential to overseas service?

D. An evaluation of the staff and general effectiveness of our effort. (Note: This was not specifically mentioned as an objective of their visit, nor was this line perceptibly developed.)

Approved For Release 2001/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06086A000100010006-5

JOB NO. BOX NO. FILE NO. DOC. NO. 6 NO CHANGE  
IN CLASS/DECLASS/CLASS CHANGED TO: IS S C REF. JUST. 22  
NEXT REV DATE 10/07/60 REVIEWER 10/07/60 TYPE DOC. 02  
NO. PCS 22 CREATION DATE 08/01/60 COMP II OPI II ORG CLASS S  
REV CLASS S REV COORD. AUTH: HR 703

25X1A9a

25X1A9a  
25X1A

3. I briefed Messrs. [REDACTED] on the structure of Field Training. This was done following a one-hour tour of the [REDACTED] conducted by [REDACTED]. I made available the 3 x 5 cards with brief biographic data on each member of Field Training. They were likewise given to read the present schedule of each course presently in session, as well as course reports of recently run courses. We showed them our training requirements so far levied on us this year, and statistics relative to past training loads, going back to 1953.

My original briefing generated few questions, but during their stay, we discussed (in addition to some of the above) the following additional subjects in general terms:

- A. Training for senior personnel.
- B. Student evaluations.
- C. The general subject of Fitness Reports.

25X1A9a

4. I discussed with [REDACTED] the ground covered with him. This included:

A. Training for senior personnel. Ray mentioned the fact that he had proposed a seminar for the fall of 1959, but that it had not materialized. (See attachment I for Ray's comments.)

B. The procurement of training material (cases) from the DDP. In this connection, Ray suggested that perhaps much could be gained by appointing a man who has just completed an assignment as instructor at Field Training, as DDP Training Officer.

C. It was Ray's opinion that the I. G. Inspectors did not delve into any subject to a sufficient depth as to make possible any hard recommendation. I concur in this view.

5. Conclusions:

A. Obviously, the real interest and "case" [REDACTED] is trying - relates to DDP's role in the training picture. Note the recurring questions as to the DDP's contribution of case materials and the role of the DDP in the evolvement of specific courses. Raised only once to my knowledge was the allied question of the rotational problems of DDP personnel assigned to Field Training.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

B. [REDACTED] appears also to be developing some reservations as to the JOT Program, e.g.:

(1) Should the JOT Program be the sole source of new blood?

(2) Is the entire Agency's needs being considered in this program?

(3) Isn't there too much emphasis on the DDP?

C. Apparently the only "categoric" conclusion arrived at by the Inspectors was that the ORT program is a "boon-doggie." This was not said as a reflection of the training received, but as a question regarding the value of this program to the Agency.

D. The Inspectors expressed a feeling that the TSS block of the OC, particularly the S/W phase, might be too long. There is something of value in this observation, and we have already noted certain reservations about this training ourselves.

E. Undoubtedly, another interest lay in the caliber of the personnel here and the quality of training. As I informed the DTR and C/OS, the general reaction of [REDACTED] as favorable - he was not effusive - but apparently impressed. 25X1A9a  
[REDACTED] parting words to me were: "A very strong operation."


25X1A

F. On 12, 13 February, the I. G. and the Intelligence Studies group were [REDACTED] Kirk was quick to mention that his representatives had "high praise" for the staff at Field Training. Later, the evening of 13 February, he mentioned again that he was going to have to straighten his men out, for they had found things "too good" and that, as Inspectors, this is not what they were supposed to find. Kirk added that he was particularly interested in [REDACTED] views, who as a student some six years ago, had not been particularly impressed. 25X1A9a  
Kirk implied [REDACTED] found the program much improved.

25X1A9a

G. Our general impression is that this was not an inspection but a familiarization tour with perhaps "one axe to grind": DDP's role in support of training.

H. I am forwarding:

- (1) An agenda of the visit. 25X1A9a
- (2) A round-up of the visit with 
- (3) Pertinent comments of some of the staff.

25X1A9a

